

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION**

DONNA CURLING, *et al.*

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

CIVIL ACTION

FILE NO. 1:17-cv-2989-AT

**STATE DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT REGARDING WHETHER THE  
COURT SHOULD CERTIFY ITS JULY 30, 2020 ORDER [DOC. 751]  
FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL TO THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

As this Court recognized during the January 19, 2021 teleconference with the parties, there are significant jurisdictional issues in this case. Issues which the State Defendants have repeatedly raised throughout this litigation. *See, e.g.*, [Docs. 8-1, 49-1, 83-1, 234-1, 645-1, 653, 658, 708, 821, 951]. Simply put, Plaintiffs continue to lack standing (among other jurisdictional bars) because they cannot demonstrate a concrete and imminent injury-in-fact that is personal to the Plaintiffs, rather than a generalized grievance, nor can Plaintiffs satisfy the traceability and redressability requirements of standing. *See Jacobson v. Fla. Sec'y of State*, 974 F.3d 1236, 1245 (11th Cir. 2020)

(vacating and ordering dismissal of voting rights case due to lack of standing).

Since this Court's July 30, 2020 Order denying State Defendants' motion to dismiss, other courts in this district and the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals have again and again dismissed similar election cases for the same jurisdictional defects that plague Plaintiffs—including cases with eerily similar challenges to Georgia's election equipment as the claims brought by Plaintiffs in this case, in some instances those other plaintiffs even utilized the orders of this Court and expert affidavits submitted to the Court in the course of this case. *See, e.g., Wood v. Raffensperger*, 981 F.3d 1307 (11th Cir. 2020); *Wood v. Raffensperger*, No. 1:20-cv-5155-TCB, 2020 WL 7706833 (N.D. Ga. Dec. 28, 2020); *Wood v. Raffensperger*, No. 1:20-cv-04651-SDG, 2020 WL 6817513 (N.D. Ga. Nov. 20, 2020), *Pearson v. Kemp*, No. 1:20-cv-4809-TCB (N.D. Ga. Dec. 7, 2020). As the Court mentioned during its January 19 teleconference with the parties, courts across the country have also rejected comparable election cases based on lack of Article III standing. *See Wisconsin Voters Alliance v. Pence*, No. 20-3791, 2021 WL 23298 (D.D.C. Jan. 4, 2021); *Bowyer v. Ducey*, No. 20-2321, 2020 WL 7238261 (D. Ariz. Dec. 9, 2020); *King v. Whitmer*, No. 20-13134, 2020 WL 7134198 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 7, 2020).

This Court rightly noted concerns regarding the propriety of having the parties expend resources on discovery while significant jurisdictional issues hang over the case. And 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) provides a process for precisely the type of situation the Court is faced with now: permitting this Court to certify its Order denying State Defendants' motion to dismiss, [Doc. 751], which involves controlling questions of law and certification of which would "materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation."

The protracted nature of this litigation shows that certification of the Court's Order will materially advance the litigation. At this juncture, the Plaintiffs in this case have filed at least ten different preliminary-injunction motions, sought various rounds of "emergency" expedited discovery, and have been granted multiple evidentiary hearings, all without materially advancing the case over the span of more than three years. Moreover, the Court's two most-recent orders on those interlocutory injunction motions are now subject to two different appeals, with one injunction being stayed pending the outcome of the appeal.<sup>1</sup> Undoubtedly, this Court will be faced with the same jurisdictional questions should it proceed without certifying the Order and

---

<sup>1</sup> These pending appeals further support the Court's certification of its order, such that it will avoid piecemeal appeals regarding this case. *See Parnell v. W. Sky Financial, LLC*, No. 4:14-cv-0024-HLM, 2014 WL 12628523 \*2 (N.D. Ga. May 29, 2014).

will be further burdened by discovery disputes, expert reports, and dispositive motions, all implicating the controlling jurisdictional matters the Court appears inclined to certify for appellate review. Consequently, State Defendants respectfully submit that a stay of proceedings pending appeal would also be appropriate here, preserving the time and resources of the parties and this Court while Plaintiffs standing is in doubt, and preventing simultaneous exercise of jurisdiction by this Court and the Eleventh Circuit.

*See Blinco v. Green Tree Servicing, LLC*, 366 F.3d 1249, 1250 (11th Cir. 2004) (citing *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982)).

Given these issues and State Defendants' pending appeals, State Defendants concur with the Court's inclination to certify the July 30, 2020 Order [Doc. 751] on State Defendants' Motion to Dismiss to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals for review.

Respectfully submitted this 21st day of January, 2021.

/s/ Vincent Russo  
Vincent R. Russo  
Georgia Bar No. 242628  
vrusso@robbinsfirm.com  
Josh Belinfante  
Georgia Bar No. 047399  
jbelinfante@robbinsfirm.com  
Carey A. Miller  
Georgia Bar No. 976240  
cmiller@robbinsfirm.com

Alexander Denton  
Georgia Bar No. 660632  
adenton@robbinsfirm.com  
Robbins Ross Alloy Belinfante Littlefield LLC  
500 14th Street, N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30318  
Telephone: (678) 701-9381  
Facsimile: (404) 856-3250

Bryan P. Tyson  
Georgia Bar No. 515411  
btyson@taylorenglish.com  
Jonathan D. Crumly  
Georgia Bar No. 199466  
jcrumly@taylorenglish.com  
James A. Balli  
Georgia Bar No. 035828  
jballi@taylorenglish.com  
R. Dal Burton  
Georgia Bar No. 097890  
dburton@taylorenglish.com  
Diane F. LaRoss  
Georgia Bar No. 430830  
dlaross@taylorenglish.com  
Bryan F. Jacoutot  
Georgia Bar No. 668272  
bjacoutot@taylorenglish.com  
Loree Anne Paradise  
Georgia Bar No. 382202  
lparadise@taylorenglish.com  
TAYLOR ENGLISH DUMA LLP  
1600 Parkwood Circle, Suite 200  
Atlanta, GA 30339  
Telephone: 678-336-7249

*Counsel for State Defendants*



**L.R. 7.1(D) CERTIFICATION**

I certify that this Response has been prepared with one of the font and point selections approved by the Court in Local Rule 5.1(C). Specifically, this Response has been prepared using 13-pt Century Schoolbook font.

/s/ *Vincent Russo*  
Vincent R. Russo